

REMARKS

Claims 1-20 are pending in the above application.

The Office Action dated November 30, 2007, has been received and carefully reviewed.

Each issue raised in that Office Action is addressed below, and reconsideration and allowance of the pending claims is respectfully requested in view of the following remarks.

Claim 1 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Shimamura. Claim 1 recites an image pick-up device that includes, inter alia, a main body, a camera for taking a picture, a display device displaying a picture taken from the perspective of the camera and arranged at a surface of said main body on the same side as said camera. The rejection of claim 1 at page 4 of the Office Action indicates that the above underlined limitation is shown by Shimamura. However, the “Response to Arguments” section of the Office Action suggests that the examiner may be misinterpreting the phrase “taken from the perspective of the camera.” Applicant does not claim an image that “matches the area in which the photograph is taken” as suggested by the Office Action. Applicant claims an image taken from the perspective of the camera. As shown by the attached definition from the Merriam-Webster Online Dictionary (www.m-w.com), the relevant meaning of “perspective,” the one that would be understood by one of ordinary skill in the art seeing the phrase “from the perspective of the camera,” is “point of view.” With reference to Figure 7 of Shimamura, it can be seen that the image in the mirror 11 will be from an upward looking perspective, toward a person’s chin, for example (if the circle and triangle are taken to represent a person’s head and body, respectively). The camera 23 on the other hand will capture an image from a somewhat downwardly directed point of view. These are two different perspectives. Shimamura therefore does not show a display device for displaying a picture from the perspective of the camera as recited in claim 1, and claim 1 is submitted to distinguish over Shimamura for at least this reason.

If this rejection of claim 1 is not withdrawn, it is respectfully requested that the examiner explain how the phrase “from the perspective of the camera” is being interpreted to mean “matches the area in which the photograph is taken.”

Claims 1-14 depend from claim 1 and are submitted to be allowable for at least the same reasons as claim 1.

Claim 15 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Shimamura. Claim 15 recites, inter alia, an image pick-up device that includes a main body having a first side and a second side, a camera for taking a picture fixed to said main body first side and having an optical axis, and a first display device including a display surface displaying a picture taken by said camera and arranged on said first side. Shimamura's mirror 11 displays an image, but as discussed above in connection with claim 1, the image in the mirror is not the same as the picture taken by the camera - the images will be from two different points of view. The statement in the Office Action that "the mirror of Shimamura displays the same image as taken by the camera..." is submitted to be inaccurate. Shimamura does not show a display surface displaying a picture taken by a camera as recited in claim 15, and claim 15 is submitted to be allowable over Shimamura for at least this reason.

If this rejection is maintained, it is respectfully requested that the examiner explain how images taken from two different perspectives can be "the same."

Claims 16-20 depend from claim 15 and are submitted to be allowable for at least the same reasons as claim 15.

REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. 103(a)

Claims 3, 8 and 17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Shimamura. Claims 3 and 8 depend from claim 1 and are submitted to be allowable for at least the same reasons as claim 1. Claim 17 depends from claim 15 and is submitted to be allowable for at least the same reasons as claim 15.

Claim 9 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Shimamura in view if Iida. Claim 9 depends from claim 1. Iida does not address the shortcomings of Shimamura discussed above in connection with claim 1. Claim 9 is therefore submitted to be allowable for at least the same reasons as claim 1.

Claims 10-12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Shimamura in view of Kuroda. Claims 10-12 depend from claim 1. Kuroda does not address the shortcomings of Shimamura discussed above in connection with claim 1. Claims 10-12 are therefore submitted to be allowable for at least the same reasons as claim 1.

Claims 10, 13 and 14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Shimamura in view Koizumi. Claims 10, 13 and 14 depend from claim 1. Koizumi does not address the shortcomings of Shimamura discussed above in connection with claim 1. Claims 10, 13 and 14 are therefore submitted to be allowable for at least the same reasons as claim 1.

To simplify the issues for review in this after final response, Applicant has focused on the differences between the independent claims and the art of record. Applicant reserves the right to argue further differences between the dependent claims and the art of record if an additional reply becomes necessary. However, it is believed that independent claims 1 and 15 clearly distinguish over the art of record and that all dependent claims are allowable as well.

CONCLUSION

Each issue raised in the Office Action dated June 15, 2007, has been addressed, and it is believed that claims 1-20 are in condition for allowance. Wherefore, reconsideration and allowance of claims 1-20 is earnestly solicited.

Should there be any outstanding matters that need to be resolved in the present application, the examiner is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned to conduct an interview in an effort to expedite prosecution in connection with the present application.

If necessary, the Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and future replies, to charge payment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 02-2448 for any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16 or 1.14; particularly, extension of time fees.

Dated: February 22, 2008

Respectfully submitted,

By 
Terrell C. Birch # 29271
Registration No.: 19,382
BIRCH, STEWART, KOLASCH & BIRCH, LLP
8110 Gatehouse Road, Suite 100 East
P.O. Box 747
Falls Church, Virginia 22040-0747
(703) 205-8000
Attorney for Applicant